



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/987,995	12/10/1997	JAMES NICHOLAS SEYMOUR	200-007711-U	6949
29683	7590	03/15/2006	EXAMINER	
HARRINGTON & SMITH, LLP 4 RESEARCH DRIVE SHELTON, CT 06484-6212				MEHRPOUR, NAGHMEH
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2686				

DATE MAILED: 03/15/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	08/987,995	SEYMOUR, JAMES NICHOLAS	
Examiner	Art Unit		
Naghmeh Mehrpour	2686		

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1)  Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 August 2004.  
2a)  This action is FINAL.                  2b)  This action is non-final.  
3)  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## **Disposition of Claims**

- 4)  Claim(s) 12-19 is/are pending in the application.  
4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.

6)  Claim(s) 12-19 is/are rejected.

7)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.

8)  Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## **Application Papers**

- 9)  The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)  The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a)  accepted or b)  objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)  The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12)  Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All b) Some \* c) None of:  
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1)  Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  
2)  Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  
3)  Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

4)  Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. \_\_\_\_\_  
5)  Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)  
6)  Other: \_\_\_\_\_

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. **Claims 12-19**, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Saji (US Patent Number 5,471,486) in view Yamamoto (US Patent 5,327,482).

Regarding **claims 12, 19**, Saji teaches a radio telephone (see figures 4) including (see figure 5) a rechargeable power supply 11 and having coupling means (a1, b1, a2, b2) (col 4 lines 40-61) for connecting to a charger unit 6 (see figure 4) for charging the power supply 11 (see figure 5), the radiotelephone (see figure 5, col 4 lines 5-12) comprising:

sensing means 15 associated with the coupling means (a1 b1, a2 b2) and operable to sense the absence or the presence of the charging unit 6 (radio telephone handset) being connected(a1 , b1, b2, b2) to the charger unit 6 (col 6 lines 60-66). Saji fails to teach an inhibiting means in such a manner that when the sensing means sense absence of the charging unit the inhibiting means automatically inhibits operation of the radiotelephone. However, Yamamoto teaches a radio telephone (see figure 19) 'comprising: an inhibiting means responsive to the means in such a manner that when the sensing means 54 senses the absence of the charging unit 200 handset (col 8 lines 49-54/, if the handset 200 is not mounted on the charger 300, it results in the battery

exhaustion, and the inhibiting means automatically inhibits operation of the radio telephone (col 8 lines 45-66). Since Saji teaches a radio telephone that detects the absence or present of charging unit 6, and Yamamoto teaches a radiotelephone that when it detects the absence of the charging unit 200, it inhibits using the phone. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Yamamoto with Saji, in order to enable the user to protect her/his cell phone from being used in case of being stolen.

Regarding **claim 13**, Saji fails to teach a radiotelephone wherein the sensor and the inhibiting means are operative for a power on mode of the radiotelephone. However Yamamoto teaches a radiotelephone wherein the sensor and the inhibiting means are operative for a power on mode the radiotelephone (col 6 lines 44-62, col 8 lines 45-66). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Yamamoto with Saji, for the purpose of making the phone unusable in case of being lost or stolen.

Regarding **claim 14**, Saji fails to teach a radiotelephone wherein the inhibiting means is adapted to inhibit access to information stored in the radiotelephone. Yamamoto teaches a radiotelephone wherein the inhibiting means is adapted to inhibit the operation of the phone (col 8 line 63-66), therefore, Yamamoto inherently inhibit access to information stored in the radiotelephone. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to combine the above teaching with Yamamoto, in order to reduce the frequency overlap in a radio personal communications system.

Regarding **claim 15**, Saji fails to teach a radiotelephone wherein the inhibiting means is adapted to inhibit making outgoing call from a radiotelephone. Yamamoto teaches radio telephone wherein the inhibiting means is adapted to 'inhibit making outgoing call from a radiotelephone (col 8 lines 63-66). Yamamoto teaches a system wherein, in case of the absence of the handset 200 from the charger 300, this causes the operation of the phone is inhibited (col 8 lines 63-66), when the operation of the phone is inhibited, the outgoing call from the radiotelephone is not possible. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Saji with Yamamoto, in order to prevent the transceiver from transmitting at the previously selected frequency if the connection has been lost.

Regarding **claim 16**, Saji fails to teach a radiotelephone comprising a memory means for storing subscriber information and an inhibiting means for inhibiting access to subscriber information stored in the memory means. Yamamoto inherently teaches a radiotelephone comprising a memory means for storing subscriber information (col 4 lines 46-48) and the inhibiting means is adapted to inhibit access (col 8 lines 63-66) to subscriber information stored in the memory means (col 4 lines 46-48). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Yamamoto with Saji, in order to enable the user to save a predetermined sequence (security code) of keystrokes that employs to disable some of the keys for the purpose of providing anti-theft feature.

Regarding **claim 17**, Saji teaches a radio telephone (see figures 4) wherein the sensor 15 (see figure 5) is adapted to sense a charging voltage 14 for charging the rechargeable power supply 11 of the radio telephone 1 (col 4 lines 50-67 col 5 lines 1-3).

Regarding **claim 18**, Saji fails to teach a radiotelephone wherein the operation of the radiotelephone is restorable responsive to a security code input to the radiotelephone. Yamamoto teaches a radiotelephone wherein the operation of the radiotelephone is restorable responsive to a security code input to the radiotelephone (col 7 lines 44-68). Yamamoto teaches a radiotelephone that previously stores its security code in an ID card. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to combine the above teaching of Yamamoto with Saji, in order making it impossible for a theft to use the cellular phone.

#### **Response to Arguments**

3. Applicant's arguments filed 8/20/04 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In response to the applicant's Saji In response to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Saji teaches a radio telephone (see figures 4)

including (see figure 5) a rechargeable power supply 11 and having coupling means (a1, bl, a2, b2) (col 4 lines 40-61) for connecting to a charger unit 6 (see figure 4) for charging the power supply 11 (see figure 5), the radiotelephone (see figure 5, col 4 lines 5-12) comprising: sensing means 15 associated with the coupling means (a1 bl, a2 b2) and operable to sense the absence or the presence of the charging unit 6 (radio telephone handset) being connected(a1 , b1, b2, b2) to the charger unit 6 (col 6 lines 60-66). Saji fails to teach an inhibiting means in such a manner that when the sensing means sense absence of the charging unit the inhibiting means automatically inhibits operation of the radiotelephone. However, Yamamoto teaches a radio telephone (see figure 19) 'comprising: an inhibiting means responsive to the means in such a manner that when the sensing means 54 senses the absence of the charging unit 200 handset (col 8 lines 49-54/, if the handset 200 is not mounted on the charger 300, it results in the battery exhaustion, and the inhibiting means automatically inhibits operation of the radio telephone (col 8 lines 45-66). Since Saji teaches a radiotelephone that detects the absence or present of charging unit 6, and Yamamoto teaches a radiotelephone that when it detects the absence of the charging unit 200, it inhibits using the phone. Therefore, by combining the above teaching of Yamamoto with Saji, enabling the user to protect her/his cell phone from being used in case of being stolen.

### Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

**5. Any responses to this action should be mailed to:**

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Naghmeh Mehrpour whose telephone number is 571-272-7913. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:00- 6:00.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Marsha Banks-Harold be reached (571) 272-7905.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

NM

June 9, 2005

*Marsha D. Banks-Harold*  
MARSHA D. BANKS-HAROLD  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600